

GAITHERSBURG, MD  
WA6-2034

HAROLD & LILLIAN WEISBERG  
\* National Chicken Cooking  
Champion



# Coo d'Or Farm

HYATTSTOWN, MARYLAND 20734

PHEASANT-CHICKENS • ROCK-CORNISH GAME HENS • WATERFOWL

8/2/66

Dear Sylvia,

To all save Crehan, of whom until your letter of the 30th I hadn't heard, I'll be sending or have sent indexes.

I've heard from O'Connell, Fields, Lifton, Marcus, Castellano and Verb.

With regard to Popkin, I have neither the time nor disposition to go into it at length. If it is necessary to point out to you the dishonesty, then in this you are alone, for even Curtis Crawford, entirely without prior discussion or prompting, went out of his way to point it out.

I did write the New York Review, and I responded to their prompt but ~~suasive~~ response. But in my first letter I specified it was a private letter, hence I think I should not be making copies. Because I never intended it for public use - I have made my position clear on the folly of internecine warfare, although it would seem that to date I am its only victim - I do not think it proper to send a copy. In my first letter I said the prof hadn't done his homework and had used a pony. He also misrepresented the publication date, and in the light of what he did, this can hardly be regarded as accidental. So now the world knows he's a great guy, and all these things he pretends he alone dug out of the 26 volumes from which we all got our data are personally credited to him, despite the fact that to his knowledge but not to his acknowledgement this is not the case. There just is neither time nor point to going into the whole thing now.

May I correct you on the "first mention" of the FBI Report that you attribute to Vince? Not so. First direct and unaltered direct quotation. There are a dozen references to the FBI report in WHITEWASH.

One last comment on Popkin: There is no major incident in his story that did not appear to his knowledge a year earlier in WHITEWASH and he acknowledged none of it. Nor in the entire lengthy review is there the slightest description of the book or the contents of the book he pretended to review or, for that matter, its history. Now this is not a question of all of us finding the same thing, not in any sense. His article is presented as a review, at least in part. But this would be true whatever its clothes.

And need I tell you the cumulative effect of such things, whether or not ill intended, such as what Vince and Arnoni did? Can you think of a single liberal or liberal-pretending publication that has reviewed WHITEWASH, or one that didn't get a copy? Or even mentioned it? I know of only the National Guardian, and they did not do that in response to the review copy I sent them, but much later, after people started asking them questions.

Hastily,